



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1480
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/086,103

02/27/2002

Nina Lewis

270/074

2757

23639

7590

02/23/2006

BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER
18 FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/086,103	Applicant(s) LEWIS ET AL.	
	Examiner CamLinh Nguyen	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is response to amendment filed on 12/9/2005.
2. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 22, and 43 are acknowledged. Consequently, claims 49 – 51 have been added, claims 1 – 51 are currently pending for further execution processing. An IDS filed 12/21/05 have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al (U.S. 6,178,511) in view of Prasanta Behera (U.S. 6,535,879).

♦ As per claim 1, 22, 43,

Cohen discloses a method for managing user schemas in a distributed computing system, comprising:

- “Creating a first global user identification for a first user” See Fig. 10, col. 8, lines 41 – 46, 63 – 67. The first global user identification corresponds to user A' identification.
- This is the global identification because the information about the user (Personal Key manager) is stored in a global database (col. 4, lines 61 – 64, col. 5, lines 16 – 21)

Art Unit: 2161

- “Creating a second global user identification for a second user” See Fig. 10, col. 8, lines 41 – 46, 63 – 67. The second global user identification corresponds to user B or X’ identification.
- “Creating a local user schema at a network node” the local user schema corresponds to the information that stored in a second database, called Configuration Information Manager (CIM) (See col. 5, lines 22 – 27). Some example of the content of CIM is described in col. 5, lines 59 – col. 6, lines 7.
- “The local user schema accessible by the first and the second users” See col. 5, lines 59 – col. 6, lines 7, and col. 5, lines 21 – 29. Both first and second users can access information in the second database from the local machine.
- “Mapping the first global user identification to the local user schema” See Fig. 7 - 8, col. 7, lines 11 – 17.
- “Mapping the second global user identification to the local user schema” See Fig. 7 - 8, col. 7, lines 11 – 17.
- “When the first user logs into the network node, assigning the local user schema to the first user with a first user role; when the second user logs into the network node, assigning the local user schema to the second user with a second user role”

Cohen teaches that the CIM may include, for example, the application type, and specific information that can be used to allow that user to access the information. Cohen also teaches that the PKM is mapped to a set of remote procedure calls on each client machine. Those remote procedure calls have different protection levels and different properties (col. 9, lines 24 – 28, Cohen). Cohen does not clearly disclose that “a scope of the privilege for the first user is based at

Art Unit: 2161

least partially on the first user role, and a scope of the privilege for the second user is based at least partially on the second user role”. In other words, Cohen does not implicitly teach that a multiple users can be associated with a same role.

However, Behera, on the other hand, discloses a method for access control via properties system that stored the access schema/role associated with an Access control List (See col. 4, lines 45 - 46). Behera teaches that the system would allow access based on role (col. 3, lines 44 – 45), and allow users to access to the same information if they have the same properties (col. 3, lines 50 – 52). In addition, Behera teaches that users in the same department can access to each other information since they have the same role. This teaching is same as claim invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the CIM data of Cohen to include the access schema as described in Behera invention because the teaching would provide more security in protecting the data using different roles for different users. As the result, the local user schema in Cohen (specific information, or information) also contains the information or data that the user can be accessed based on user privilege.

- “ Wherein the first user and the second user have different privileges on the network node” see col. 3, lines 38 – 45, Behera.

◆ As per claims 2, 23, 44, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:

- “ The method of claim 1 in which the first and second global user identifications are stored in a directory” col. 11, lines 54 – 56, Cohen.

◆ As per claims 3, 24, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:

- “The method of claim 2 in which the directory comprises a LDAP directory” See col. 3, lines 9 – 30, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 4, 25, 45, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which the network node is a database server” See Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 60 67, Cohen.
- ◆ As per claims 5, 26, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which a data object maps the first global user identification to the local user schema” See Fig. 7 - 8, col. 7, lines 11 – 17, col. 9, lines 24 – 28, Cohen.
- ◆ As per claims 6 - 7, 27 – 28, 47, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 5 in which the data object specifically maps only the first global user identification to the local user schema” Because this process is applied for a single user, therefore, the data object specifically maps only the first global user identification to the local user schema.
- ◆ As per claims 8 - 9, 29 – 30, 48, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 5 in which the data object potentially maps multiple users to the local user schema”, “The method of claim 8 in which the data object maps based upon a partial identification of the users” See col. 4, lines 40 – 44, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 10 – 11, 31 – 32, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 5 in which the data object maps based upon a specific computer node”, “The method of claim 10 in which the data object resides in a directory beneath an associated server object” See col. 6, lines 38 – 42, Cohen.
- ◆ As per claims 12 - 13, 33 – 34, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:

Art Unit: 2161

- “The method of claim 5 in which the data object maps based upon a domain”, “The method of claim 12 in which the data object resides beneath a domain object” See col. 4, lines 52 – 53, 64 – col. 5, lines 2, Cohen.
- ◆ As per claims 14, 35, 46, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which the first user role and the second user role are different” See col. 3, lines 38 – 45, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 15, 36, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which privileges associated with the local schema are assigned to the first and second users” See col. 4, lines 45 – 46, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 16, 37, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which an entry-level mapping object maps a specific user and in which a sub tree-level mapping object potentially maps multiple users based upon a partial match of user identifications, wherein the entry-level mapping object takes precedence over the sub tree-level mapping object” See Fig. 6, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 17, 38, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which an server mapping object and a domain mapping object both map a user, wherein the server mapping object takes precedence over the domain mapping object” Fig. 6, col.4, lines 63 – col. 5, lines 4, Behera.
- ◆ As per claims 18 - 19, 39 – 40, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:
 - “The method of claim 1 in which a record is maintained to track mappings to the local user schema that provides an audit trail corresponding to the first and second users. The

method of claim 18 in which the record distinguished between mappings for the first and second users” See fig. 5, Cohen.

◆ As per claims 20 – 21, 41 – 42, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:

- “ The method of claim 1 further comprising the act of creating a local mapping at the network node, in which the first user is mapped to the local schema only if the local mapping does not contain a mapping for the first user” See col. 5, lines 6 – 67, Cohen.
- The method of claim 1 further comprising the act of creating a non-shared schema at the network node, the local user schema being a shared schema at the network node, in which the first user is mapped to the shared schema only if the first user is not mapped to the non-shared schema” See col. 5, lines 49 – 58, Cohen.

◆ As per claims 49 - 51, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose:

- “ Wherein the scope of privilege for the first user and the scope of privilege for the second user are based also on the local user schema” see col. 3, lines 38 – 45, Behera.
- “The scope of privilege” sees col. 3, lines 38 – 39 of Behera.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Behera does not disclose assigning the same local user schema to different users with different roles. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2161

As disclosed above, Behera allows users to access to the same information (local user schema) based on privilege (col. 3, lines 38 – 39 of Behera). Therefore, the combination of Cohen and Behera disclose the claim limitation.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272 - 4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 – 273 - 8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Art Unit 2161


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

LN